

## **REMARKS**

Applicants reply to the Final Office Action mailed on February 2, 2009 within the shortened statutory period of two months. Applicants amend claims 1, 4-8, 12, 14-17 and 22-23 without prejudice or disclaimer to the filing of one or more related applications with the previously filed claims, and add claim 42. Thus, claims 1-8, 10-20, 22-23, 25 and 42 (1 independent, 23 total) remain pending in the application. Applicants request reconsideration of the presently pending claims.

In regards to the applicable priority date, the prior response mistakenly cited the specification pages of the present application. However, U.S. Application No. 09/559,678 (“‘678 application”), to which the present application claims priority, does disclose a display in communication with a “universal connectivity station” element. The ‘678 application teaches a display 34 in Figure 4. Furthermore, discussion of the display 34 occurs at page 12 line 23 – page 13 line 16, and page 17 line 13 – page 18 line 4. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the applicable priority date of the present application, and whether the Edwards reference constitutes applicable prior art. However, in the interest of compact prosecution, Applicants have also amended claims and sufficiently addressed the pending rejections to overcome the cited reference.

## **§102 Rejection**

In the subject Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 4-16, 20, 21, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Edwards, et al., U.S. Publication No. 2004/0024809 (“Edwards”). Specifically, the Office Action states that Edwards discloses a connectivity device capable of interfacing with a handheld portable communications

device and facilitating transmitting data to a remote display.

In general, Edwards discloses a method and system for enabling arbitrary components to control data transfer without having or requiring prior knowledge of each other (Abstract). A plurality of handheld devices is networked with a server and a projector (See Figure 1). Additionally, in Edwards, object-oriented programming and creating proxy objects accessible by a PDA of attached network devices. 26-27

However, Edwards does not disclose nor contemplate “[a] connectivity device with a bus, comprising: a processor executing an operating system; a data module adapted to store visual presentation data; a first interface responsively coupled to the processor and adapted to communicate with a physically remote **handheld portable communications device via a first serial link**; and a second interface responsive to the processor and adapted to drive the visual presentation data to a physically remote display as a function of commands received from the physically remote handheld portable communications device, wherein the visual presentation data is communicated to the physically remote **display via a second serial link, wherein data on the first and second serial link is in a different format than the format of data on the bus**”, as recited in amended, independent claim 1 (emphasis added).

For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that Edwards does not disclose or contemplate all of the elements of independent claim 1, and Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference.

Additionally, dependent claims 2-8, 10-20, 22-23, 25 and 42, variously depend from independent claim 1, so dependent claims 2-8, 10-20, 22-23, 25 and 42 are

allowable over the cited reference for the reasons set forth above, in addition to their own unique features. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the above noted §102 rejection of claims 1, 4-16, 20, 21, and 25.

**§103(a) Rejection**

Furthermore, Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards in view of Scott, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0088452.

Claims 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards in view of Cherian, U.S. Patent No. 6,493,745.

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards in view of Tsakiris, U.S. Patent No. 5,736,968.

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards in view of Snowdon et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,671,737.

None of the above references alone or in combination teach or suggestion each and every element of Applicants' amended claim 1. Since claims 2-3, 18-19, 20, and 23 depend from amended claim 1, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the §103(a) rejections and allowance of claims 2-3, 18-19, 20, and 23.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the currently pending claims (1 independent, 23 total) are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, please contact me at 602-382-6306.

Applicants authorize and respectfully request that any fees due (including extension fees) be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-2814. **This statement does NOT authorize the payment of the issue fee.**

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 2, 2009

Adam J. Stegge  
Adam J. Stegge, Reg. No. 63,297

**SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.**  
400 E. Van Buren  
One Arizona Center  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202  
Phone: 602-382-6306  
Fax: 602-382-6070  
E-mail: [astegge@swlaw.com](mailto:astegge@swlaw.com)